UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/675,697	09/30/2003	Amanda Baer	HSJ9-2003-0032US1 (0107-0	6166	
ATTN: John J.	7590 08/10/200 Oskorep	EXAMINER			
One Magnificer		GRAMAGLIA, MAUREEN			
Suite 1400 980 N. Michiga	n Avenue	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Chicago, IL 606			1792		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/10/2009	PAPER	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



## **UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10675697	9/30/03	BAER ET AL	HSI9-2003-0032US1

(0107-0)

ATTN: John J. Oskorep One Magnificent Mile Center Suite 1400 980 N. Michigan Avenue Chicago, IL 60611 EXAMINER

Maureen Gramaglia

**ART UNIT PAPER**1792 20090806

DATE MAILED:

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner for Patents** 

The Office communication mailed 23 July 2009 has been vacated.

In response to the Order returning the undocketed appeal to the Examiner mailed on 4 August 2009, the following clarification is made:

The Status of Claims in the Appeal Brief of 17 March 2008 was incorrect. Specifically, Claims 21, 22, and 27 should have been indicated as finally rejected but not on appeal.

The Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal in the Appeal Brief of 17 March 2008 was incorrect. Specifically, only Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8-16, 18, 23-26, and 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,315,875 to Sasaki in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0027730 to Lille.

Claims 21 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Lille, and further in view of Konuma et al. Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Lille, and further in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Applicant did not present any separate arguments against the rejections of Claims 21, 22, and 27. Thus, it appears that Claims 21, 22, and 27 were finally rejected but not on appeal, and that the rejections of Claims 21, 22, and 27 are not on review.

Section (6) of the Examiner's Answer of 28 May 2008 correctly indicates the Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal and the Grounds of Rejection not Withdrawn but not on Review.

/Maureen Gramaglia/ Examiner, Art Unit 1792

/Parviz Hassanzadeh/ SPE, AU 1792